

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

TYSHONN CADE,

Defendant and Appellant.

B291211

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. NA106979)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Laura L. Laesecke, Judge. Affirmed.

Joseph T. Reisz, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

In 2018, the Los Angeles County District Attorney charged defendant Tyshonn Cade (defendant) with two felonies: possession of a firearm by a felon (Pen. Code, § 29800(a)(1)¹) and carrying a loaded firearm in public (§ 25850(a)). The charges were predicated on evidence that, on July 24, 2017, two police officers saw defendant discard a loaded, semi-automatic pistol after jaywalking. The officers arrested defendant and he admitted that he had been carrying the pistol in his right front pants pocket.

The jury convicted defendant of both charged offenses. The trial court sentenced him to five years in state prison for the felon-in-possession charge, calculated as the mid-term of two years, doubled pursuant to the Three Strikes law (§§ 667(b)-(i), 1170.12), plus an additional year for a prior prison term enhancement (§ 667.5(b)). The trial court imposed and stayed a sentence on the carrying a loaded firearm charge pursuant to section 654.

This court appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. After examining the record, counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues. On December 12, 2018, this court advised defendant he had 30 days to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. We received no response.

We have examined the appellate record and are satisfied defendant's attorney has complied with the responsibilities of counsel and no arguable issue exists. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278-82; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 122-24; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

¹ Undesignated statutory references that follow are to the Penal Code.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

BAKER, J.

We concur:

RUBIN, P. J.

KIM, J.